

PATENT APPLICATION FEE DETERMINATION RECORD  
Effective December 29, 1999

Application or Docket Number

09/610 142

## CLAIMS AS FILED - PART I

FOR	NUMBER FILED	NUMBER EXTRA
BASIC FEE		
TOTAL CLAIMS	8	minus 20 = /
INDEPENDENT CLAIMS	1	minus 3 = /
MULTIPLE DEPENDENT CLAIM PRESENT		

\* If the difference in column 1 is less than zero, enter "0" in column 2

## CLAIMS AS AMENDED - PART II

AMENDMENT A	(Column 1)	(Column 2)	(Column 3)
	CLAIMS REMAINING AFTER AMENDMENT	HIGHEST NUMBER PREVIOUSLY PAID FOR	PRESENT EXTRA
Total	7	Minus 20	= /
Independent	1	Minus 3	= /
FIRST PRESENTATION OF MULTIPLE DEPENDENT CLAIM			

SMALL ENTITY TYPE	OTHER THAN OR SMALL ENTITY
RATE	Fee
345.00	OR
X\$ 9=	/
X39=	/
+130=	130
TOTAL	475
OR	TOTAL

SMALL ENTITY TYPE	OTHER THAN OR SMALL ENTITY
RATE	ADDI- TIONAL FEE
X\$ 9=	/
X39=	/
+130=	/
TOTAL ADDT. FEE	OR TOTAL ADDT. FEE

AMENDMENT B	(Column 1)	(Column 2)	(Column 3)
	CLAIMS REMAINING AFTER AMENDMENT	HIGHEST NUMBER PREVIOUSLY PAID FOR	PRESENT EXTRA
Total	8	Minus 20	= 0
Independent	1	Minus 3	= 0
FIRST PRESENTATION OF MULTIPLE DEPENDENT CLAIM			

AMENDMENT C	(Column 1)	(Column 2)	(Column 3)
	CLAIMS REMAINING AFTER AMENDMENT	HIGHEST NUMBER PREVIOUSLY PAID FOR	PRESENT EXTRA
Total	8	Minus	=
Independent	1	Minus	=
FIRST PRESENTATION OF MULTIPLE DEPENDENT CLAIM			

\* If the entry in column 1 is less than the entry in column 2, write "0" in column 3.

\*\* If the "Highest Number Previously Paid For" IN THIS SPACE is less than 20, enter "20".

\*\*\* If the "Highest Number Previously Paid For" IN THIS SPACE is less than 3, enter "3".

The "Highest Number Previously Paid For" (Total or Independent) is the highest number found in the appropriate box in column 1.

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

DEC 22 2004

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

Application : 09/610,142  
Applicant : Masahiro Ito  
Confirmation : 4378  
Filed : July 5, 2000  
TC/A.U. : 3623  
Examiner : Jeanty, Romain  
Docket No. : 719-X00-006

Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria VA 22313-1450

**PRELIMINARY RESPONSE TO OFFICE ACTION**

Sir:

Responsive to the Office Action mailed August 23, 2004, Applicant seeks clarification of certain inconsistencies in the Office Action which make it impossible for the Applicant to formulate a full and proper response. Specifically, in section 5 of the Office Action (Note: the sections are mis-numbered in the Office Action; the section in question here is the second section 5, which should actually have been numbered as section 6), claims 6, 7 and 8 were rejected "...under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as anticipated by Walker et al "Walker" (U.S. 6,594,638)." The use of the term "anticipated" in combination with the reference to Section 103 renders the rejection ambiguous; it is not